

Amendment Dated January 17, 2006  
Appln. No. 10/715,089

Attorney Docket No.: 27475/05431

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Please replace drawing sheet 2/6 (including Figures 3 and 4) with the attached drawing sheet 2/6 (including Figures 3 and 4). Bracketing has been added to the Figures as requested by the Examiner.

Attachment: Annotated Drawing Sheet showing Changes (1 Page)  
Replacement Drawing Sheet (1 Page)

Amendment Dated January 17, 2006  
Appln. No. 10/715,089

Attorney Docket No.: 27475/05431

### REMARKS

#### Drawings:

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings because the Examiner believes that Figs. 3 and 4 should include bracketing. The replacement drawings filed herewith include bracketing to overcome the Examiner's objection.

#### Abstract:

The Examiner also objected to a portion of the abstract that was added by the amendment filed on March 16, 2005 because the Examiner believes that the added portion introduces new matter into the disclosure. While Applicants believe that the added portion does not introduce new matter, this portion has been deleted to overcome the Examiner's objection.

#### Rejected Claims:

In the Office Action, claims 26-28 and 29-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 because the Examiner believes that these claims fail to comply with the enablement requirement. While Applicants believe that these claims do comply with the enablement requirement, all of these claims except for claim 28 have been canceled. Claim 28 has been amended to depend from claim 21 and to remove any reference to "external apparatus." Applicants believe that the amendments to claim 28 overcome the Examiner's 112 rejection.

Additionally, claims 1-3, 21, 24-27, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) because the Examiner believes that these claims are anticipated by Ellis. In explaining the rejection, the Examiner noted that "front" and "rear" are relative terms. While Applicants believe that these claims patentably distinguish over Ellis, independent claims 1 and 21 (from which claims 2-3 and 24-25 depend) have been amended to further clarify that the first

Amendment Dated January 17, 2006  
Appln. No. 10/715,089

Attorney Docket No.: 27475/05431

attachment element extends from a front edge of the first end portion of the mounting bracket toward the front portion of the toilet bowl. Moreover, claims 26-27 and 29-30 have been canceled. Applicants believe that these amendments overcome the Examiner's 102 rejections.

Allowed/Allowable Claims:

In the Office Action, claims 4-20, 22, and 23 were indicated to be allowed. Applicants gratefully acknowledge this indication.

Additionally, claim 28 was indicated to be allowable if appropriately rewritten. As stated above, Applicants believe that the amendments to claim 28 overcome the Examiner's 112 rejection. However, claim 28 has not been rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims because claim 28 has been amended to depend from claim 21 and Applicants believe that the amendments to claim 21 overcome the Examiner's 102 rejection.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in proper condition for allowance, and such allowance is hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date:

1/17/06

  
Ryan W. Falk (Reg. No. 54,090)  
Cust. No. 24024  
Phone (216) 622-8206  
Fax (216) 241-0816

